

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

**2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT
FOR:
Indianapolis Algebra Project (Compiled Final Report)**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	In Compliance
Recruiting Materials	Satisfactory	Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	In Compliance
Academic Program	Unsatisfactory	Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	In Compliance
Progress Reporting	Unsatisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	See Report		
		Student/instructor ratio: 4-1:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

Provider submitted corrective action plan addressing concerns detailed from initial monitoring visit.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Indianapolis Algebra Project
REVIEWER: ST, CE

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 12-19-06

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	S	U	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	ONE of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>) -Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>) -Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)	-Recruitment policy -Tutor resumes/applications -Tutor contracts	S		Tutor qualifications from resumes/applications and stated in recruitment policy match those in provider application.
Recruiting materials	TWO of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Program brochure -Recruitment fliers -Incentive policy	S		Recruitment brochure, fliers, and incentive policy are acceptable and match provider application.
Academic Program	ONE of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for one class in all subjects offered <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Detailed lesson description -Specific connections to Indiana standards -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	-Lesson plan -Specific connections to Indiana standards -Description of connection to district		U	While lesson plans submitted connect to Indiana academic standards and match provider application, observed lessons did not resemble these lesson plans.
Progress Reporting	TWO of the following: -Sample progress report -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	-Progress reports -Timeline for sending progress reports		U	Progress reports do not clearly describe student progress. Progress reports do not match original application. Reports are not uniform (not all progress reports used the same format or shared the same level of detail). In addition, the timeline for reporting progress to teachers (monthly) does not match the description in the application which states progress will be reported to teachers and parents on a weekly basis.

On-site Monitoring Rubric
OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Indianapolis Algebra Project

1st DATE: 12-14-06, 2nd DATE: 1-30-07, 3rd DATE: 3-22-07

1st SITE: Clinton Young Elementary 5740 McFarland Road, 2nd SITE: Clinton Young Elementary School, 3rd SITE: Garfield Elementary School (Muncie, IN)

TUTOR’S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 1st site: LM, EM, 2nd site: MO, LM, EM, 3rd site: CH

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 1st site: 4:40pm, 3rd site: 3:30pm

REVIEWERs: ST, CE, MC, KS, SF

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1st site: 6, 2nd site: 3, 3rd site: 1

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	X		<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p> <p>Students completed workbook pages or worksheets on multiplication facts, adding/subtracting/dividing/multiplying numbers with 3-5 digits, identifying fractions, and a word find activity in which the words to be found were related to monetary units. When students completed their work, they waited for tutors to review it. Although tutors answered questions when students needed assistance, tutors did not provide differentiated and individualized instruction that was highlighted in the application. Lessons were not based on cooperative learning or inquiry-based learning as described in the application.</p> <p>Observed lessons do not match original description in provider application.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>Tutors each guided students through lessons, asking questions and ensuring that students understood concepts. Tutors used manipulatives (coins, flashcards, etc.) to help students learn concepts, as described in the application. Two tutors worked with math concepts, including Algebra and using money. A third tutor worked on English/Language Arts concepts, using flashcards and worksheets.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Students worked on a fraction activity with their tutor. Each student had a bag with pictures of shaded shapes. The tutor called out a fraction and asked the students to select the shape that represented the fraction. Students also played a math bingo game on fractions. Students had bingo boards with fractions in columns, the tutor drew and shaded different shapes on a white board, the students reviewed their bingo boards for the appropriate fraction amounts and placed their chips on the board if they found a match.</p> <p>Observed lessons match description in provider’s original application. As per the application, both inquiry-based learning and cooperative learning were observed.</p>
Instruction is clear	X		<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p>

		<p>There appeared to be little structure provided during the tutoring session observed. At times students were unclear on what they should be working on once an assignment had been checked or they'd finished an activity. Although tutors answered questions when students needed assistance, tutors did not provide differentiated and individualized instruction that was highlighted in the application. The only instruction that was observed was provided by one student who was independently providing instruction to another student needing assistance completing a practice worksheet on times tables. While the application does state peer-tutoring may be used, the student provided instruction with no supervision or guidance from either tutor present. The application also states that a "Lead Teacher will guide...[tutors] in the delivery of the instructional program", however, the high school tutor received no direction or coaching from the lead teacher. Lastly, the application states inquiry-based learning, cooperative learning, and prescriptive tutoring will be used to assist students. However, these techniques were not observed to be utilized by either tutor.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>Students appeared to understand what was expected of them and tutors seemed to understand the concepts that were being taught. Students were provided with guidance at the beginning of each new concept so as to better understand it. As listed in the section below (Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable), it did appear that the high school tutor had some difficulties helping the student understand difficult concepts (i.e., the tutor was not always able to incorporate multiple strategies to help the student understand).</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Tutor was very good at checking with each student to ensure he/she understood the concept being discussed. When a student was not clear, tutor provided additional examples specifically for that student and reviewed the information with the student one-on-one.</p>
Time on task is appropriate	X	<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p> <p>While 5 out of the 7 students observed were usually focused on completing their assignments, 2 students were observed being off task frequently. One of these students was observed drawing pictures on the board and reading a Kids Sports Illustrated magazine instead of working on his assignments while both students were observed wandering the room or their desk area when distracted. However, it should be noted that both tutors periodically (although not immediately) redirected these students to return to their assignments. In addition, the student who was observed helping another student on times tables, appeared to have no assignments of her own on which to work. Also, there were times when many of the students finished their work and had nothing to do while waiting for instructions from the tutors who were occupied working one on one with another student.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>Students and tutors were 100% on task at all times. Transition times were very short.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>The students were very involved in their math lessons and seemed to enjoy the bingo game. They worked diligently on completing their activities, however, when necessary the tutor appropriately redirected students to stay on task.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X	<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p> <p>Although tutors answered students' questions, there were times when multiple attempts were needed to formulate explanations (this was particularly the case with the high school student tutor) that the students could comprehend. In addition, the lead tutor/teacher did not demonstrate knowledge about the proper procedure for disclosure of information regarding special needs students. As reviewers were leaving, she announced across the room and in front of the other children that the student to her right was a special needs child. The lead tutor then proceeded to explain the child's deficiencies by showing reviewers (in front of the child and the other children at the table) how she incorrectly writes numbers. Also, the lead tutor appeared to be unfamiliar with the education plan that, as per the application, is developed for each student and should serve as the basis for instruction. When asked to explain how tutors know what each student should be working on, this tutor shared a binder with sections for each child that included standards for that child's grade level (which would only be relevant if the child's skills were at grade level proficiency). Reviewers again asked about</p>

		<p>the education plan for each child, however, the tutor shared that the only plan she could think of was the lesson plan which she showed to reviewers. However, this too was not the appropriate plan as it was one page that included some activities for the entire group with the dates 12/5, 12/7, & 12/12 (although the observation date was 12/14). This lesson plan was not individualized for each student nor did it encompass goals or timelines as the application indicated are all a part of each child’s education plan.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>All three instructors appeared to work well with the children and knew what they were supposed to be teaching. All understood concepts well. However, it appeared that at times, the high school tutor was unable to use multiple strategies to help the student understand difficult concepts. While the tutor was patient and rephrased instructions often, it appeared that the tutor would have benefited from closer guidance from one of the other more experienced tutors and would benefit from learning some additional instructional strategies for helping students understand difficult concepts. It also appears in the application that the high school student is to be a tutorial assistant; however, the student did not receive guidance or oversight from the two other tutors in the room, other than their being present. The high school tutor appeared to act in the same capacity as the two other tutors, which does not match the description of “tutorial assistant” provided in the application.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Tutor seemed well aware of each student’s strengths and areas for improvement. Tutor maintained a good rapport with the students and provided encouragement and positive feedback when appropriate. Tutor was able to provide students with examples of multiple ways to solve problems and related new concepts to information the students had learned in past lessons.</p>
Student/instructor ratio: <u>4-3:1</u>	X	<p><u>VISIT #1</u></p> <p>Application notes that the ratio will be 10:1 and that instruction will be individual or in small groups. A 4-3:1 ratio and small groups were observed.</p> <p><u>VISIT #2</u></p> <p>Application notes that the ratio will be 10:1 and that instruction will be individual or in small groups. A 1:1 ratio was observed.</p> <p><u>VISIT #3</u></p> <p>Application notes that the ratio will be 10:1 and that instruction will be individual or in small groups. A 3:1 ratio and small groups were observed.</p>

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric **COMPLIANCE Components**

NAME OF PROVIDER: Indianapolis Algebra Project
REVIEWER: ST, CE

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 12-19-06

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	ALL of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks	X	
Health and safety laws and regulations	ONE of the following: -Student release policy(ies) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Safety records/procedures -Transportation policy - Student release policy -Address Change form -Transportation permission form	X	
Financial viability	TWO of the following: -Notarized business license or formal documentation of legal status -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Certificate of Incorporation -Tax return for FY 2004 & FY 2005	X	